

**MINUTES  
COLUMBUS PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
OCTOBER 13, 2010 AT 4:00 P.M.  
MEETING HALL, CITY HALL  
123 WASHINGTON STREET  
COLUMBUS, INDIANA**

**Members Present:** Bryan Haza (President), Roger Lang, Tom Wetherald, Brian Russell, Steve Ruble, John Hatter, Ann DeVore, Dave Bonnell, Dave Fisher, Dick Gaynor and Tom Finke (Bartholomew County Liaison).

**Members Absent:** None.

**Staff Present:** Jeff Bergman, Laura Thayer, Sondra Bohn, Rae-Leigh Stark, Derek Naber, and Alan Whitted (Deputy City Attorney).

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Minutes of the September 8, 2010 meeting (Approval and Signing).

There was a correction to the minutes on members present at the September 8, 2010 minutes.

Request by Cheryl Zuckschwerdt-Ellsbury of the Bartholomew County Humane Society for a waiver of the filing fee for a Board of Zoning Appeals petition.

Ms. Elsbury represented the petitioner.

Ms. Elsbury stated that the Human Society was short on funds and was requesting that the Plan Commission waive the fee that would be required to file for a conditional use. Ms. Elsbury stated that this was the same request that was approved two years ago for a mobile trailer to house the animals on site. She stated the approval had expired and they needed an extension until they can afford to construct a building.

**C/RZ-10-04: Grooms and Smith Rezoning** – a request by Dwight and Linda Grooms and Mark and Carolyn Smith to rezone properties totaling 7.05 acres from I1 (Light Industrial) to CC (Community Commercial). The properties are located on the east side of County Road 220 East, between County Road 100 South and State Road 46, or more specifically, 4540 East State Street and 4475 East County Road 100 South, in Columbus Township. ***(Referred to the Plan Commission by the City Council for consideration of rezoning conditions.)***

**C/MP-10-09: Harrison Knolls South Minor Subdivision** – a request by Bruce Nolting to create 2 new lots for a total of 3 lots equaling 35.81 acres; and for approval of a modification from Section 16.24.060 of the Subdivision Control Ordinance which requires sidewalks or other pedestrian systems in all subdivisions except administrative and agricultural subdivisions. The property is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of County Road 250 South and

County Road 475 West, in Harrison Township.

**C/MP-10-10: Harrison Knolls North Minor Subdivision** – a request by Bruce Nolting to create 2 new lots for a total of 3 lots equaling 43.03 acres; and for approval of a modification from Section 16.24.060 of the Subdivision Control Ordinance which requires sidewalks or other pedestrian systems in all subdivisions except administrative and agricultural subdivisions. The property is located on the west side of County Road 475 West, ± ¼ mile south of Carr Hill Road, in Harrison Township.

Mr. Bergman presented the background information on the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Bergman stated that the Plan Commission had sent a favorable recommendation with conditions to the City Council on the Grooms and Smith Rezoning. He stated there was a discussion at that meeting and they changed two words in the conditions. The wording of landscaping “present” was changed to landscaping “present.” The other item dealt with screening regarding outdoor storage, the wording was “present,” and it was changed to “restore.” Mr. Bergman stated this was more consistent with the intent of the discussion and staff would support the change.

Mr. Bergman stated Harrison Knolls South Minor Subdivision was asking for a modification from installing sidewalks along County Road 475 West and County Road 250 South. He stated that the nearest community sidewalk is about a mile away on Champion Drive in Tipton Lakes

Mr. Bergman stated that Harrison Knolls North Minor Subdivision was asking for a modification from installing sidewalks along County Road 465 West. He stated there is some distance between the nearest community sidewalk and this would not fit into the existing system for the City.

Mr. Haza inquired if anyone in the audience was there to speak on these items.

There was no one to speak for or against these requests.

Motion: Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Hatter seconded the motion and if carried unanimously by voice vote.

#### **OLD BUSINESS REQUIRING COMMISSION ACTION**

**C/PUDF-10-03: Sam’s Club** – a request by Sam’s Club to amend a final PUD to allow the installation of new cart corrals. The property is located at 2715 Merchant’s Mile, in the City of Columbus. *(Sam’s club has requested that the request be withdrawn.)*

Mr. Bergman read a letter from Sam’s Club’s officials asking to withdraw the request without prejudice for installation of cart corrals.

Motion: Ms. DeVore made a motion to approve Sam’s Club request to withdraw this request without prejudice. Mr. Gaynor seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 11-0.

## **NEW BUSINESS REQUIRING COMMISSION ACTION**

**C/DP-10-04: BCSC Health Services Center** – a request by Bartholomew Consolidated School Corporation for site development plan approval for a health services center. The property is located at 912 5<sup>th</sup> Street in the City of Columbus.

Mr. Naber presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Steve Forster, Maintenance Director for BCSC and Ron (inaudible) from Dunlap and Company represented the petitioners.

Mr. Forster stated that with the rising costs of health care BCSC wanted to try to reduce some of those expenses. He stated they wanted to start a project for a health care service clinic for personnel and would be doing some physicals and some medication disbursements there. Mr. Forster stated this location would fit that need for the services they were trying to provide and would be consistent with the residential neighborhood area.

Mr. Forster stated there would be one physician and one assistant employed there. He stated most of the appointments would be scheduled by the computer and the building would not be occupied all day some of the time. Mr. Forster stated the building would be used as needed for consultation and appointments with the doctor.

Mr. Fisher asked what kind of on street parking is available at this location. Mr. Forster stated that along 5<sup>th</sup> Street there is 90 feet along the north curb line just south of the building. He stated it was their opinion that the parking at this site was adequate and would not require the number of spaces required by the Ordinance.

Mr. Fisher asked why the sign was located at the proposed site. Mr. Forster stated a picture of the sign was enclosed in the packets and it was placed in a way that would be readable from both 5<sup>th</sup> and Chestnut Streets.

Mr. Lang asked if they had a long-term master plan if this site is successful. He stated it was his opinion that there were not enough parking spaces for staff and the visitors. Mr. Forster stated this was an experiment they were trying.

Mr. Lang suggested that this be approved for a two-year period and then come back to Plan Commission with a master plan, depending on the success of the project. Mr. Forster stated they would be willing to do that and bring more information on how the parking is working and if they need to take steps to tear down the garage to accommodate more parking spaces.

Mr. Forster stated there might be a possibility for additional parking in the nearby Cummins lot or the St. Peters Lutheran Church lot that is directly across the street and south of the clinic. Mr. Forster stated that the lot is full on Sundays, but there might be some vacant parking spaces available during the week for the overflow parking.

Mr. Bergman asked about the time limit of two years attached to the Development Plan as opposed to some other type of indicator that would be more appropriate to gauge what was going on at this location. Mr. Bergman stated he did not recall a time limit being attached to a site plan approval previously.

Mr. Whitted stated he would discourage having the two-year time period included in the

approval of this request. He stated traditionally this has not been done in the past and another benchmark might be more appropriate.

Mr. Haza stated if this clinic were successful, the bigger issue for BCSC would be the lack of space in the building, rather than lack of parking.

Mr. Lang stated that parking in this area has been problematic in the past. He stated it was his understanding that an agreement has been reached with Cummins and St. Peters Church for the existing parking lot. Mr. Lang asked if BSCS would be willing to negotiate an agreement with the church for the overflow parking.

Mr. Forster stated if they torn down the existing garage on the north side of their lot they would have room for six or seven more parking spaces.

Mr. Bergman stated it would be appropriate to tie the approval of this request to the number of employees at the facility. He stated as the use of the property expands the parking would need to be increased and the parking issue could be revisited

Much discussion was held regarding the parking and the expansion of the clinic at this site.

Mr. Ruble asked if the location of the proposed clinic was in a historical area. Ms. Thayer stated it was the Reeves home, Mr.,. Reeves was the owner of Reeves Pulley Company located in Columbus. She stated the home and garage were included in the National Register historic district, but there are not any restrictions on what can be done with the property.

Ms. DeVore suggested that employees could park in the new parking lot that was constructed for Central Middle School between California and Chestnut Streets, which was two blocks away.

Ms. DeVore suggested they talk to St. Peters Lutheran Church and work out an agreement with them to use a part of their parking lot for the overflow of traffic for the clinic. Mr. Forster stated they would be willing to pursue this with the church.

Mr. Bonnell stated it was his opinion that there would be ample space for parking at this site for the clinic with all the alternatives that were available.

Mr. Haza opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Gary Wirth, owner of Regency Apartments that is located behind the clinic expressed concern regarding the parking for the clinic. He stated when they were building the Central Middle School he had experienced some parking problems with the construction people.

Mr. Haza closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated that enforcing any designated parking areas would not be possible without the BSCS cooperation. He stated the agreement with St. Peters Lutheran Church for the overflow parking would be the best alternative of all the options that were discussed.

Motion: Mr. Lang made a motion to approve this request with the condition attached: A signed agreement must be executed with St. Peter Lutheran Church that would allow

employees and/or visitors to use the parking lot south of the subject property for overflow parking. Mr. Bonnell seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 11-0.

Mr. Russell left the meeting at this time.

**C/PUDF-10-04: Menard's** – a request by Mainsource Bank to amend the Menard's final PUD plan to allow a drive-up ATM. The property is located in the Columbus Crossing PUD (Planned Unit Development), on the southwest corner of Merchants Mile and Carr Hill Road, in the City of Columbus.

Mr. Naber presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Ted Darnall with Crowder and Darnell Surveying and Joe Stirn, Director of Maintenance for Mainsource represented the petitioners.

Mr. Darnall stated they have had several meetings with staff on this project and have reworked the initial site plan. He stated what was before the Plan Commission is the results of the best possible plan for this ATM kiosk.

Mr. Darnall stated the plan for traffic flow is for the vehicles to enter from the north and exit to the south from Carr Hill Road. Mr. Darnall stated he did run a traffic pattern analysis and a standard passenger car can make all the turning maneuvers with no problems.

Mr. Darnall stated they have an agreement with Menards to replace all missing/dead or dying landscaping or Mainsource would assume responsibility for replacement of landscaping.

Mr. Darnall stated that the kiosk is raised and the electrical coming in and other utility equipment is located to prevent water from accumulating within these components during conditions of flooding. Mr. Stirn stated it would be an aluminum steel building and the elevations show it will be located above the base flood elevation..

Mr. Darnall stated the site plan shows the proposed landscaping for this site. He stated in the beginning it was suggested that the backside of the ATM kiosk be screened in a denser pattern than what was proposed. He stated the access door is on the rear side of the building where employees would enter. Mr. Darnall stated the primary concern is for the safety of the employees and the customers who use the site. He stated they have proposed a less dense landscape plan so that it that would meet the safety requirements.

Mr. Haza opened the meeting to the public.

There was no one to speak for or against this request.

Mr. Haza closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated staff would recommend approval of this request with staff comments being addressed and the landscaping plan that is proposed by Mainsource.

Motion: Ms. Devore made a motion to approve this request with the following conditions: (1) Menards shall replace all missing/dead or dying landscaping by June 30, 2011, (2) The building footprint square footage of the kiosk shall be added to the site plan and (3) The kiosk shall be built with materials and utility equipment that is resistant to flood damage and all

electrical or other utility equipment are located so as to prevent water from accumulating within these components during conditions of flooding. Mr. Ruble seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 10-0.

Mr. Russell returned to the meeting.

**C/AG-10-01: Clifty Creek Open Space Agricultural Subdivision** – a request by Lynn Finkel for a modification from Section 16.08 of the Subdivision Control Ordinance to create an agricultural tract that is 9.63 acres in size, 10.37 acres smaller than the required 20 acres. The property is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of 25<sup>th</sup> Street and County Road 500 East, in Clay Township.

Ms. Stark presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Rik Sanders with E.R. Gray & Associates represented the petitioners.

Mr. Sanders stated the parcel of land that they are proposing to subdivide is a portion that was used as a landfill for solid waste. He stated that Mr. Finkel has an opportunity for a farmer to take over the portion of the ground that is left for farmland. Mr. Sanders stated there are no issues at this time, but with new rules changing all the time they want the farm ground separate.

Mr. Haza opened the meeting to the public.

There was no one to speak for or against this request.

Mr. Haza closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff would recommend approval of this request.

Motion: Mr. Bonnel made a motion to approve this request. Mr. Russell second the motion and it carried with a vote of 11-0.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Columbus Thoroughfare Plan and Subdivision Control Ordinance Design Standards – a review and discussion of the current content and status of the proposed Thoroughfare Plan and Subdivision Control Ordinance Design Standards, including recommended revisions resulting from public input received subsequent to the Commission's favorable recommendation to the City Council. The City Council has requested that the Plan Commission hold a public hearing on the revised documents, make additional revisions as needed, and forward the new recommendations to the City Council.

Mr. Ruble presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Ruble stated that after the City Council met to hear the Columbus Thoroughfare Plan they decided that they wanted to solicit additional public input from the community before a final vote. They also requested that the document be presented to the Columbus Plan Commission again after the public meetings were held.

Mr. Ruble stated since the initial City Council meeting was held the City Engineer's Office, Planning Department, and CAMPO have conducted two public open houses, provided several presentations to community groups, and held numerous individual and small group

discussions. As a part of this public input process, the staff has created revised versions of both the Thoroughfare Plan and the Subdivision Control Ordinance Design Standards.

Mr. Ruble stated that the most notable changes are revisions to the proposed reserved future connections in the area as shown as Agriculture on the City's Comprehensive Plan. He stated many of those connections were removed and the Thoroughfare Map is more closely aligned with the City's Future Land Use Map.

Mr. Ruble stated that roundabouts would be considered with the same weight as other intersection control treatment.

Mr. Ruble stated that the Project Properties list has been modified to reflect changes that were made on the map.

Mr. Gaynor stated that the Airport Board members have had discussion regarding the proposed road that parallels existing River Road at the airport. He asked what the expected time frame would be regarding construction of the road. Mr. Ruble stated we might see this constructed in approximately twenty years, given the priority lists that has been modified. Mr. Ruble stated that would be appropriate to pass this information onto the Airport Commission. Mr. Ruble stated he would be willing to meet with them at their convenience.

Mr. Bergman stated that the Airport Board would be in control of construction of the road up to a point. He stated that the road would be constructed as development occurs at the Airport and the traffic demand is generated by the development. Mr. Ruble stated if there were no growth, there would be no need for the road. Mr. Ruble stated that the alignment for the road was established when they considered the existing development and the other industrial types of development that might occur at this site.

Mr. Gaynor stated that the FFA has requested a new master plan for the airport before construction of a new tower. He stated this should be within the next six months. Mr. Bergman stated it was his impression that the Airport Board had already given their approval to the alignment of the new road that was shown on the map. Mr. Gaynor stated there was concern regarding the placement of the new tower and this had occurred within the last two weeks. Mr. Bergman stated that perhaps this should to be revisited by the Airport Board.

Mr. Bonnell asked about the time period for the construction of County Road 200 South. Mr. Ruble stated that this project is considered under the next list of projects that the City might pursue. He stated that would mean that they would start a scope study; start preliminary engineering but would not start construction. He stated if they are talking about utilizing federal funding a project of this scale and if it were started immediately, there would be a space of seven to ten years for construction.

Mr. Haza opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Albert O'Connor stated he was opposed to the County Road 200 South plan. He stated that this improvement to the road would affect his potential revenue from his farm. Mr. Connor stated this farm had been in his family for generations and will remain there for many years to come. He stated he was speaking for the other farmers in the area and they are all opposed to the Thoroughfare Plan with regard to the County Road 200 South extension.

Mr. O'Connor questioned how that the cost of this road extension could even come close to providing the taxpayers with any economic benefits.

Mr. David Foust stated that the plan is suppose to be a conceptual one and nothing is firm at

this point. He stated he was concerned about the road that comes out Shadow Creek Farms to the north. Mr. Foust stated this road is not included on the map, but he wanted to know if it was subject to change. He stated it was his opinion that the roundabouts that were so controversially have been taken off the map, but they also could be put back in at anytime. He stated it was his opinion that this was just to appease the community to receive approval from the City Council. Mr. Foust expressed concern about a road coming through his property, which has been in the family for a hundred and twenty years. He also is concerned about the excess tax dollars that would be spent on this project. Mr. Foust expressed concern about County Road 200 South being congested with so much traffic before they constructed Shadow Creek farms. He stated there should be some consideration given before the roads are constructed. He stated it was his opinion that the land between Southside School and the Bartholomew County 4-H ground would be better utilized by constructing a road at this site, rather than the proposed County Road 150 West.

Mr. Haza closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bonnell stated that he had some concerns about the long-range plans for the roads through the agriculture areas, especially the ones around Talley Road and the County Road 200 South project. He stated he would like more discussion about this area and how it affects the farmland and the private property. He asked how this could be addressed.

Mr. Ruble stated the some of the connections that are shown would not be constructed unless there is development in this area. He stated the City's Comprehensive Plan states this area may be developed as residential subdivisions in the future. He stated these would come before the Plan Commission for approval.

Mr. Ruble stated specifically County Road 200 South extension is a project that does include some construction through some agriculture land. The plan currently indicates that this should be pursued ahead of some other type of development that may cause this to happen. Mr. Ruble stated that in the future the Second and Third Street bridges off State Road 46 West will exceed capacity and that all the modeling sent by the Department of Transportation has shown that to be problematic for the City. He stated that the County Road 200 South crossing would go a long way to alleviate the traffic. Mr. Ruble stated by looking at the Thoroughfare Plan map it makes some obvious connections that would provide some transportation efficiencies for the community and that is why it is on the map.

Mr. Bergman stated one of the issues that came out of the public input meetings was a communication issue that the original document did not distinguish future roads that the City might construct vs. ones that developers would be required to install by the Plan Commission when the property is developed. He stated that was one of the issues that the revisions corrected by paring the map with the spread sheets that identify the City's priorities. He stated that most dashed lines on the map mean new roads, as the development would occur.

Mr. Bergman stated that the two new roads on the City priority list are County Road 200 South extension and the County Road 150 West extension. Other than those, the dashed lines are guidance for the Plan Commission when development occurs at those locations.

Mr. Bergman stated there was text added to the document that says:

*"The Thoroughfare Plan maps show a number of new street connections to be made at an undefined point in the future. While the vast majority of these new connections are intended to be constructed in segments if and when development occurs in those areas, others are included on the City initiated Project Priorities list. In no instance should any of these connections on the*



*Thoroughfare Plan Map be interpreted as show exact alignments for new streets, they are instead intended to represent conceptual connections from one location to another.*

*It is recognized by this document that the actual implementation of the new connections shown will be highly dependent on numerous unknowns, such as future traffic demand, timing and location of future development, and engineering and financial feasibility. These unknowns do not invalidate the need for or content of this Plan, but rather reinforce the appropriateness of viewing the new connections as conceptual. As such, they should in no way be interpreted as or used to limit the current use of the areas in which they are located. For example, most of the areas in which new connections are shown are currently used for agriculture. The presence of these conceptual connections should not serve to limit the issuance of building permits for homes or barns, limit the installation of irrigations systems, or otherwise inhibit ongoing agricultural activity. These conceptual connections should, however, be incorporated into new subdivisions and other developments in these areas. In instances in which a very small numbers of lots (2 to 4) are created by a property owner in a way that does not involve the creation of any new streets maximum flexibility should be provided to that property owner in the location of those lots while still preserving viable options for the future connections.*

*Further, in no way should any future connection shown on the Thoroughfare Plan Map be interpreted as establishing an easement or right-of-way for that connection or in any way claiming private property for public use."*

Ms. DeVore stated she wanted to stress that this is for the future and is not set in concrete. She stated twenty years ago no one would have ever thought that the area around Talley Road or south of the fairgrounds would have ever been developed. Ms. DeVore stated that farmers are in control of the development of the properties. If they want to sell their land and put a development there, that would be their choice. Ms. DeVore stated that the Plan Commission is here to help manage that development.

Motion: Ms. DeVore made a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the City Council as presented. Mr. Crider seconded the motion and it carried unanimously 10-1 by voice vote with Mr. Bonnell being the nay vote.

Mr. Bergman asked if Mr. Bonnell would like some additional discussion on the Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Bonnell stated that this is a personal preference. He stated he understood the purpose of the plan and that this is the direction, the City wants to go. Mr. Bonnell stated he had a problem with the plan's implication particularly for the County Road 200 South area. Mr. Bonnell stated he would hate for the development areas to reach out into the farmland with roads and stated most of his input from constituents has been opposed to this happening. He stated the northeast side of the City was the area that he would not want to see developed.

## **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Bergman reminded the Plan Commission members of the Joint Plan Commission meeting Wednesday, October 20, at 6:30 p.m. in the Meeting Hall.

Mr. Bergman stated staff has investigated the cart corrals at Menards and after looking at aerial photographs and talking with Tom O'Neil from Menards, it was determined that they have been at this location at least since 2004. He stated through discussion with Mr. O'Neil it was likely they were not a concern at the Plan Commission at the time Menards first opened the property. Mr. Bergman stated his recommendation would be accept them as they are. He stated that staff maintains a Columbus Crossing User Guide which will be used to address cart corrals for the future.

Mr. Bergman stated he wanted to comment on the landscaping enforcement item. He stated for many years enforcement was handled by Bartholomew County Code Enforcement, which included illegal signs, junk cars, etc. He stated one of the things that was done was a position was created in the Planning Department for another enforcement position to add some additional resources. He stated that plan has been successful and the individual in Planning reviews several hundred complaints each year. Mr. Bergman states the complaints involve inoperable vehicles, trash, scraping of vehicles in neighborhoods and numerous others. He stated most complaints are public driven and they are given the highest priority. Mr. Bergman stated there is not a lot of time for this person to go out and randomly check for landscaping violations.

Mr. Bergman indicated that reviewing previously required landscaping when properties returned for subsequent approvals was an effective alternative given the enforcement resources available.

#### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

#### **LIASION REPORT**

**ADJOURNMENT: 6:00 p.m.**

---

**Bryan Haza, President**

---

**Steve T. Ruble, Secretary**